



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

As a portrait of the man this work is admirable; and although not free from a certain bias which is natural enough when we consider that the author is a son of the personage described, it is doubtless essentially accurate. The pervading strain of Puritan piety and a certain simplicity of nature, which were among Morse's most striking characteristics, are amply displayed.

It is not surprising, perhaps, that there should be even less of electricity in the account of Morse the inventor than of art in that of Morse the painter. All that pertains to art is regarded as literature; all except the vaguest generalities concerning science is deemed mere technical "shop". To the reader of these pages it will nevertheless be clear that the transition which occurred in 1832 was not from art to science, but from art to invention. Although Morse brought with him to America Daguerre's great discovery and through it came into touch with one of the keenest and most fertile minds of the time, it was Draper who first applied photography to research, while Morse used it in the making of portraits. Although from his work upon the telegraph came acquaintance with Joseph Henry and with his great achievements in electricity, the connection led to no scientific results.

To the fact that Morse was neither a man of science like Draper or Henry, nor an inventor of the usual type, but a large-minded, intensely patriotic Yankee of the sort not uncommon in his day, was probably due his great success. His dream, which he tried in vain to make a reality, was to turn the telegraph over to the government of his country for the use of its citizens forever; his vision was always of the great benefit to humanity which was to come from his labors.

E. L. NICHOLS.

*Reconstruction in North Carolina.* By J. G. DE ROULHAC HAMILTON, Ph.D., Alumni Professor of History, University of North Carolina. [Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law, edited by the Faculty of Political Science of Columbia University, vol. LVIII., no. 141.] (New York: Columbia University. 1914. Pp. 683.)

PROFESSOR HAMILTON'S volume has a double value. As a study of the process of reconstruction within a state, it illustrates the principal usefulness of research in the local field—the visualization of the character and results of national policies. The book is also the only comprehensive survey of the history of North Carolina from 1860 to 1876, in fact it is the most extensive single contribution to any period of the state's history. A distinguishing feature is the transition of interest back and forth from matters of primarily local importance to those of more national interest.

One of the author's conclusions is that if the Congressional plan of reconstruction had not been applied, North Carolina would to-day, "so

far as one can estimate human probabilities, be solidly Republican." Evidence for this conclusion is the analysis of political history from 1850 to 1867, which is given in the first four chapters. The theme is the decline of the Whig party after 1850, the rise of a radical type of democracy and of the sentiment favorable to secession, the return of Whig leadership with the Vance administration during the war, and the continued supremacy of the Whigs "who had no thought of joining in politics their old opponents the Democrats", in the elections under the Johnsonian plan of restoration. Such an interpretation from such evidence is not to be rejected, but the reader is not guarded against inferring some wrong deductions, while certain details of significance are unduly emphasized, and others are omitted. Thus one should not conclude that all of the North Carolina Whigs were deeply attached to the Union or that secession was entirely the work of the Democracy. As a matter of fact in the legislative debates over slavery extension in the session of 1850, a set of radical states' rights resolutions was introduced by a prominent Whig and conservative Democrats and Whigs co-operated in their defeat. Moreover, the defection of Clingman, who leaned toward secession, is not mentioned. Division within the party over the slavery issue which is not mentioned, as well as the manhood suffrage issue raised by the Democrats, which is related, was a cause of the decline of whiggery in North Carolina. Nor is the record of Whig leadership from its revival in the election of 1862 complete. It is rather singular that a considerable number of former Whigs drifted into the peace movement. Among these was Worth, the treasurer of the state, who wrote resolutions for local meetings in the interest of peace. (See *Correspondence of Jonathan Worth*, vol. I., *passim*.) The management of the state finances during the war was not in all respects wise and conservative. As the writer points out, the actual bond and note issues were not so great as were authorized, but there is no mention of the unwise management of the securities of the Literary Fund and the Sinking Fund. Likewise, the financial policy from the close of the war to the opening of the radical régime is not clarified; some measures were the exchange of railway bonds for unproductive stock, the final wreckage of the Literary Fund, the abolition of the office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, and making local taxation for school purposes optional. These facts should warn us against considering the record of the North Carolina Whigs as one of efficiency or unity. Therefore, supposing that the Whig element should have gone over to the Republican party in 1867, as the author suggests, might there not have been considerable opposition to it?

With chapter V. interest veers to national, rather than local, politics. It gives an admirable analysis of military administration under the Reconstruction Acts. Other chapters on the Union League and the Freedmen's Bureau likewise visualize the reaction of national politics on local conditions. When however the theme again reverts to affairs primarily

local, the treatment is not so satisfactory. The details of extravagance and corruption are well marshalled, likewise the rise of the Ku Klux, Holden's use of force, and the resulting impeachment. But the frequent use of oral tradition as authoritative, the continual reliance on the leading conservative newspaper, whose editor was probably mentally deranged, and a warm sympathy with the struggle for redemption from radical misrule, leave the impression that mercy is never offered the reconstructionists and that in some cases extenuating circumstances are not duly considered. A distinct contribution to knowledge of the period after 1868 is the revelation of the cleavage within the Republican party and the use of federal patronage especially in the elections of 1872.

A singular omission among the sources for the period is the Johnson manuscripts in the Library of Congress, which are illuminating for affairs in North Carolina from 1865 to 1867. There is no bibliography and the map is misleading with respect to railway lines in operation in 1865. The style is superior to that of the average work of its class, riveting attention to matters of minor as well as of major importance.

Wm. K. BOYD.

*The Anthracite Coal Combination in the United States: with some Account of the Early Development of the Anthracite Industry.*

By ELIOT JONES, Ph.D., Associate Professor of Economics, State University of Iowa. [Harvard Economic Studies, vol. XI.] (Cambridge: Harvard University Press; London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press. 1914. Pp. xiii, 261.)

Is there an anthracite coal "combination"? In his selection of a title for his book, Dr. Jones assumes that there is; and in his preface he says: "This combination controlling the anthracite coal trade is found to be a combination of railroads, owning either directly, or indirectly through subsidiary coal companies, substantially the entire area of the anthracite coal deposits of the United States."

This charge of "a general combination to control the anthracite coal industry", said the Supreme Court, deciding the government's anti-trust suit against the Reading Company and other anthracite railroads, is "the theory upon which the bill is framed and upon which the case has been presented" (*United States v. Reading Company*, 226 U. S. 324, 343, 1912). The Supreme Court in this case held that this charge was not established. Absence of "documentary evidence of solidarity", which Dr. Jones implies was the determining fact, was really only one of the considerations. "We have gone through the record", said the Supreme Court (*ibid.*, p. 346). "The acts and transactions which the bill avers to have been committed by some of the defendants in furtherance of the illegal plan and scheme of a general combination" (*ibid.*, p. 371) and which, the Supreme Court decided, did not establish any such *general combination*, are variously characterized by Dr. Jones